

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

ANGEL TORRES,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
CITY OF CHICAGO,)	
a municipal corporation,)	08 C 0282
OFFICER JERRY DOSKOCZ, Star #6573,)	
a Chicago Police Officer,)	Judge Kendall
in his individual capacity,)	
OFFICER KENNETH FLAHERTY, Star #13584,)	Magistrate Judge Denlow
a Chicago Police Officer,)	
in his individual capacity,)	
CHICAGO POLICE OFFICER JOHN DOE #1,)	
Star number unknown,)	
in his individual capacity,)	
CHICAGO POLICE OFFICER JOHN DOE #2,)	
Star number unknown,)	
in his individual capacity,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

JOINT INITIAL STATUS REPORT

WHEREFORE, this matter set before Judge Kendall on March 26, 2008 at 9:00 am for an initial status, attorneys for both sides completed a joint initial status report.

In support of said joint initial status report:

1. Attorneys for the Plaintiff are Brian J. Barrido, Richard J. Dvorak and Neil L. Toppel. All three are expected to try the case for the Plaintiff at trial. Attorneys for the defendants are Assistant Corporation Counsels Matthew R. Hader, Megan K. McGrath and Marcela D. Sanchez.
2. The basis for federal jurisdiction is invoked by the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, § 1988, the judicial code 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and §1343 (a), the Constitution of the United States and pendent jurisdiction, as provided under U.S.C. § 1367 (a).
3. The nature of the federal claims are excessive force, failure to intervene and false arrest. The Illinois State claims are battery, false imprisonment and malicious prosecution. Plaintiff also seeks indemnification (on federal claims only) by the City of Chicago.

4. Two Chicago Police Officers have yet to be served. These officers were unknown at the time of filing this joint initial status report.
5. The principal legal issues fall within 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleged excessive force by Chicago Police Officers John Doe #1 and #2, and by the alleged false arrest and malicious prosecution of Plaintiff.
6. The principal factual issues fall within the underlying dismissed criminal matter and with what occurred at the hospital after the arrest.
7. At this time, jury trial is expected by both sides.
8. Written discovery is still underway. Plaintiff expects to tender Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures, interrogatories and requests to produce within 21 days. No depositions have been scheduled at this time.
9. The parties expect to be ready for trial by February 9, 2009. Trial is anticipated to take approximately four days.
10. At this time, the defendants are not prepared to proceed before the Magistrate Judge.
11. No settlement discussions have occurred on this case. Plaintiff will make a written demand as soon as feasible.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian J. Barrido
Brian J. Barrido
One of Plaintiff's Attorneys
3859 W. 26th Street
Chicago, IL 60623
(773) 521-1300
brian.barrido@civilrightsdefenders.com

/s/ Matthew R. Hader
Matthew R. Hader
Assistant Corporation Counsel
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 742-9586
matt.hader@cityofchicago.org

/s/ Megan K. McGrath
Megan K. McGrath
Assistant Corporation Counsel
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1020
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 744-8369
megan.mcgrath@cityofchicago.org

/s/ Marcela D. Sanchez
Marcela D. Sanchez
Assistant Corporation Counsel
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1020
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 744-9332
msanchez@cityofchicago.org